

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

PANACEA PLANT SCIENCES, INC., and  
DAVID HELDRETH, CEO,

Plaintiffs,

v.

MERRICK B. GARLAND, in his official  
capacity as U.S. Attorney General, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. C24-477RSM

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR  
EXTENSION OF TIME

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff Panacea Plant Sciences, Inc. (“PPS”)’s one-page, *ex parte* Motion for Extension of Time, Dkt. #11.

On April 16, 2024, the Court found that PPS was not represented by counsel in violation of LCR 83.2 and directed it “to secure counsel and for that counsel to make an appearance in this case prior to the filing of future motions or requests for relief, and in any event no later than May 16, 2024.” Dkt. #9 at 2. PPS now moves to extend that deadline to June 20. Dkt. #11 at 1. The only explanation for this request is “we are experiencing difficulty finding those who wish to litigate against the government.” *Id.* No other facts are provided. There is no attached declaration.

1 “A motion for relief from a deadline should, whenever possible, be filed sufficiently in  
2 advance of the deadline to allow the court to rule on the motion prior to the deadline,” LCR  
3 7(j), and a motion for relief should be granted where “good cause” exists. *See Allstate Indem.*  
4 *Co. v. Lindquist*, No. C20-1508JLR, 2022 WL 1443676, at \*2 (W.D. Wash. May 6, 2022).  
5 When seeking an extension, the good cause standard primarily considers the diligence of the  
6 party seeking the extension. *Id.*

8 PPS has failed to set forth any evidence of efforts to obtain counsel. PPS does not  
9 engage with the good cause standard. The record appears to indicate that PPS has known about  
10 the potential for litigation for some time. The Court has good reason to insist on PPS being  
11 represented by counsel, as this party has already filed several Motions in this case *ex parte*  
12 despite already being in contact with Defendants through the parallel regulatory matter, and  
13 because the person drafting briefs on behalf of PPS is also a Plaintiff in the case.

15 The Court finds that PPS has failed to demonstrate diligence in seeking this relief, or  
16 good cause to request it.

18 Accordingly, having considered the above Motion and the remainder of the record, the  
19 Court hereby FINDS and ORDERS that PPS’s Motion, Dkt. #11, is DENIED.

20 DATED this 6<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2024.

21  
22 

23 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ  
24 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
25  
26  
27  
28